

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 7 and 8 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Kobler et al. in view of Otsuka et al., stating that Kobler et al. teaches a reciprocating electric shaver wherein the middle cutting unit is movable vertically from a standard position to both upper and lower positions and teaches all of the elements of the present invention except for at least one cutting unit having a foil outer cutter, an inner cutter is floatably supported, and the inner cutter is in sliding contact with the inner surface of the outer cutter; Otsuka et al. teaches a reciprocating electric shaver with floatably supported inner cutting units at col. 6, lines 44-47; the use of a foil-form outer cutters 58 and inner cutters 70c in pressed contact with the outer shearing foil at col. 8, lines 18-32; and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Otsuka et al. into Kobler et al.

In reply thereto, Applicant has carefully reviewed Kobler et al. and respectfully submits that the two outer cutters of the three identical elongated shear heads extending parallel to each other are fixed in their position and do not move at all. See Fig. 3 wherein the two outer shear heads abut against a cover plate 7 and are not movable therethrough. In addition, the middle cutter of the three is only movable by means of a rack and gears from a lower position to a higher position as is shown in Fig. 2 and also is not floatably supported. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion in Kobler et al. and particularly in Figs. 2 and 3 that the outer cutters would be floatably supported on the inner cutter. Still further, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no description in Kobler et al. as to the manner in which the inner cutter is supported and no internal cutter is shown and it only suggests that the internal cutter would be guided in a conventional manner (see col. 2, lines 38-40). Applicant respectfully submits that not only is no mechanism shown for the inner cutter, but probably in 1960 when Kobler et al. was filed, the inner cutter would not have been floatably supported and there was no teaching or requirement that they would be. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the construction of Kobler et al. does not show, suggest or teach a floating inner cutter or any requirement for a floating inner cutter.

Applicant has carefully reviewed Otsuka et al. The Examiner suggests that Otsuka et al. has a floating inner cutter, but Applicant respectfully submits that Otsuka et al. does not have a floating inner cutter in the sense of Applicant's invention. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that the structure of Otsuka et al. provides a seesaw movement since the cutter heads 5

are permitted to be resiliently displaced downwardly at either of the longitudinal ends (see col. 6, lines 35-39). Still further, Applicant respectfully submits that the outer cutters or cutting heads are supported at their ends by horizontal extension 37 in corporation with the resilient beams 35 to define a spring support member for supporting the corresponding longitudinal ends of the cutter head 5 so that each end of the cutter head is resiliently movable vertically substantially independently from the other longitudinal end (see col. 6, lines 13-15). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that it is not the floating inner cutter which supports the outer cutter but instead this spring support member which supports the longitudinal ends of the outer cutters to allow the seesaw or rocking motion.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that not only is the combination suggested by the Examiner not Applicant's invention, but also the combination suggested by the Examiner would not be suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 7 and 8 are not obvious over Kobler et al. in view of Otsuka et al.

In view of the above, therefore, it is respectfully requested that this Request for Reconsideration be entered, favorably considered and the case passed to issue.

Please charge any additional costs incurred by or in order to implement this Request for Reconsideration or required by any requests for extensions of time to KODA & ANDROLIA DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 11-1445.

Respectfully submitted,

KODA & ANDROLIA

By: 

William L. Androlia
Reg. No. 27,177

2029 Century Park East
Suite 1140
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2983
Tel: (310) 277-1391
Fax: (310) 277-4118

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on March 17, 2006.


Name

3/17/2006
Signature Date